

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Final Office Action mailed on September 5, 2003, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 1, 10, 20, and 28 are amended. Applicant amended the claims to more clearly recite the claimed subject matter. Claims 1-42 are pending in this application.

Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter was added in amended claims 1, 10, 20, and 28, and that the specification supports the amendments. For example, support for the amendments to claims 1, 10, 20, and 28 can be found throughout the specification, including, but not limited to, page 20, lines 4-28; page 22, line 22 through page 23, line 2; and Figure 8.

Finally, Applicant respectfully requests an indication as to the acceptability of the drawings in the next official communication.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-8, 10-25, and 27

Claims 1-6, 8, 10-25, and 27 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe (U.S. Patent No. 6,088,652) in view of Berstis (U.S. Patent No. 6,182,010) and Nanba, et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,739,772). Claim 7 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe, Berstis, and Nanba as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Yokoyama, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,263,276). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection as follows.

Applicant's independent claims 1, 10, and 20, as amended, recite an electronic navigational aid device that recognizes an approaching decision point in a route and provides to a display an overlay to display the decision point. The decision point recited in the claims includes a highlighted portion indicating a course to follow through the decision point, and displays motion of the device on the course through the decision point.

The Examiner cited Berstis to at least illustrate an overlay screen on top of a presently displayed screen. From Applicant's review, it appears Berstis provides a navigation system for a vehicle in which images or text are superimposed on or associated with the image to facilitate navigation (see the abstract). The images in

Berstis appear to include still photographs of the intersection (see the abstract), that can include a visual cue in the form of a "direction arrow 96" superimposed on the graphical image. Berstis, however, fails to teach or suggest a decision point that includes a highlighted portion indicating a course to follow through the decision point, and/or displays motion of the device on the course through the decision point, as recited in claims 1, 10, and 20.

The Examiner also cited Abe to at least illustrate an electronic navigation aid device, and Nanba to at least illustrate advancing direction guidance information at guide branch points. Abe and Nanba, however, do not cure the above identified deficiencies of Berstis. For example, Abe fails to teach or suggest displaying motion of a device on a course through a decision point, as recited in claims 1, 10, and 20. Nanba displays "advancing direction guidance information" with "guide branch points" (see Col. 6, lines 8-16), where "the present position is indicated by a mark of a triangle encircled by a circle" (Col. 6, lines 45-46). Nanba, however, fails to teach or suggest displaying motion of a device on a course through a decision point in the overlay screen, as recited in claims 1, 10, and 20. As such, each and every element of independent claims 1, 10, and 20 is not taught or suggested in Abe, Berstis, and Nanba, either independently or in combination. Therefore, the 103 rejection should be withdrawn.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the 103 rejection for the above independent claims, as well as those claims which depend therefrom, are respectfully requested.

Claims 28-42

Claims 28-33 and 35-42 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe, Berstis, and Nanba as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Harada (U.S. Patent No. 6,052,645). Claim 34 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe, Berstis, Nanba, and Harada as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Yokoyama, et al. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicant's independent claim 28, as amended, recite a navigation system for negotiating a decision point along a route that recognizes an approaching decision

point in the route and triggers an overlay screen on the navigation device to display a decision point with a highlighted portion indicating a course to follow through the decision point, and displays motion of the navigation device on the course through the decision point.

As noted above, Abe, Berstis, and Nanba do not describe these aspects of the Applicant's invention.

The Examiner recited Harada to at least illustrate the use of a server and the communication between a navigation system and the server. Applicant respectfully submits that Harada, however, does not cure the above identified deficiencies of Abe, Berstis, and Nanba. As such, each and every element of independent claim 28 is not taught or suggested in cited documents, either independently or in combination. Therefore, the 103 rejection should be withdrawn.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the 103 rejection for the above independent claims, as well as those claims which depend therefrom, are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney at (612) 659-9340.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to the Deposit Account No. 501-791. Additionally, please direct all future correspondence regarding this case to: 1200 E. 151ST ST., OLATHE, KS 66062, ATTENTION: DEVON A. ROLF.

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: MS AF Commissioner for Patents, P.O. BOX 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 30th day of October, 2003.

Name

Sarah L. Reinhard
Signature

Respectfully Submitted,
Jay Dee Krull, et al.

By their Representatives,
E.J. BROOKS & ASSOCIATES, PLLC
1221 Nicollet Avenue, Suite 500
Minneapolis, MN 55403

By: Joseph C. Huebsch
Joseph C. Huebsch
Reg. No. 42,673

Date: Oct. 30, 2003